J. Douglas
11/13/02
(N.E)

\*

PATENT

#### REALNET.009A

DECEIVE (11-8-02)

# IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Greenbaum

Appl. No.: 09/300,139

Filed: April 27, 1999

For: Multi Rate Codec

Examiner: August 14, 2002

Examiner: Senfi, Behrooz

Group Art Unit 2613

CERTIFICATE OF FAX TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence and all marked attachments are being transmitted via facsimile to Examiner Behrooz Senfi, Fax No. (703) 872-9314 of the USPTO on the date shown below:

November 8, 2002

Eric M. Nelson, Reg. No. 43,829

### RESPONSE

United States Patent and Trademark Office P.O. Box 2327 Arlington, VA 22202 ATTENTION BOX: AF

### Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action, dated August 14, 2002, Applicant has the following comments.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-12, 14-17, 19, 20, 22, 24-32, 34-42, 44, and 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application, 2001/0013952, to Boon (hereinafter "Boon"). As discussed with the Examiner on November 1, 2002, published applications are not prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) for pre PG-PUB applications. M.P.E.P. 2136.01 states "[w]hen examining a pre PG-PUB application (see MPEP § 2136), a U.S. patent must issue, or SIR must be published before it can be used as a referenced in a 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection." The present application is a pre-PG PUB application since it was filed prior to November 29, 2000. See M.P.E.P. § 2136. Since the present application is a

Appl. No.

09/300,139

Filed

April 27, 1999

pre PG-PUB applications, Boon--a published patent application, cannot serve as a basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Claims 13, 18, 21, 23, 33, and 43, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boon in view of US. Patent Application No. 2001/0038674, to Trans. Applicant respectfully submits that Trans is also not prior art for the reasons discussed above.

Furthermore, Applicant also maintains that the present claims are patentable over Boon and Trans for the reasons identified in the Response, filed May 15, 2002.

# Summary

Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action. In light of the above remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions which may be answered by telephone, he is invited to call the undersigned directly.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 100, 8, 2002

By:

Eric M. Nelson

Registration No. 43,829 Attorney of Record Customer No. 20,995

(619) 235-8550

S:\DOCS\EMN\EMN-1967.DOC 110802